

## PUBLIC HEARING ON PAPERS

### Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

19 September 2025

**Name:** RILEY-ALLSOPP, Sophie

**Registration number:** 287880

**Case number:** CAS-201089

---

**General Dental Council:** Georgina Mayles, IHLPS (not present)

**Registrant:** Not present  
Not represented

---

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired by reason of conviction and misconduct

**Outcome:** Suspended indefinitely

**Duration:** N/A

---

**Committee members:** Val Evans (Lay) (Chair)  
Vatsal Amin (Dentist)  
Joshua Kelly (Dental Care Professional)

**Legal adviser:** Trevor Jones

**Committee Secretary:** Gareth Llewellyn

- 
1. Neither party is present at this resumed hearing of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The hearing is being conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams in line with the Dental Professionals Hearings Service's current practice. The GDC has invited the Committee to conduct the hearing on the papers in the absence of both parties.

### **Purpose of hearing**

2. The purpose of today's hearing is to review a substantive direction of suspension first imposed on Miss Riley-Allsopp's registration by the PCC on 21 September 2023. The hearing is being held in accordance with section 36Q of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').

### **Service**

3. The Committee first considered whether service has been properly effected in accordance with the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules').
4. In their written submissions the GDC submitted that Miss Riley-Allsopp has been properly notified of today's hearing in accordance with Rule 28 of the Rules. The Committee noted that a notice of hearing was sent to Miss Riley-Allsopp's registered address on 7 August 2025 using the Royal Mail's Special Delivery postal service. The notice set out the date and time of the hearing, as well as confirming the nature of the hearing and the powers available to the Committee. The Royal Mail's Track and Trace service records that the notice was delivered on the afternoon of 8 August 2025. Copies of the notice were also sent to Miss Riley-Allsopp by first class post and email.
5. The Committee accepted the advice provided by the Legal Adviser. Having regard to the GDC's submissions and the evidence placed before it the Committee was satisfied that service has been properly effected in accordance with the Rules.

### **Proceeding in absence**

6. The Committee then went on to consider whether to exercise its discretion to proceed in the absence of Miss Riley-Allsopp in accordance with Rule 54 of the Rules. It was mindful that the discretion to proceed in the absence of a registrant must be exercised with the utmost care and caution. In their written submissions the GDC invited the Committee to proceed in the absence of Miss Riley-Allsopp.
7. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
8. The Committee had regard to an email from Miss Riley-Allsopp of 18 August 2025 in which she acknowledged receipt of the notice of hearing that had been sent to her by email. Miss Riley-Allsopp stated that she has not worked in dentistry for over three years, that she had thought that she would have been taken off the register, that she no longer wishes to be on the register, and that she has no intention of returning to the profession.
9. The Committee determined that Miss Riley-Allsopp has voluntarily absented herself from these proceedings, and that no injustice would be caused to her by the Committee proceeding in her absence. The Committee is of the view that an adjournment, which has not been requested, would be unlikely to secure Miss Riley-Allsopp's attendance at a rescheduled hearing. The Committee was also mindful of the public interest in the expeditious

consideration of this case, bearing in mind the imminent expiry of the extant suspension on 25 October 2025.

### **Existing order**

10. In September 2023 the PCC held a hearing of inquiry in relation to allegations about Miss Riley-Allsopp's fitness to practise. Miss Riley-Allsopp was not present at the hearing, and was not represented in her absence. The Committee heard, and went on to find proved, allegations that Miss Riley-Allsopp had been convicted of drink driving and had failed to co-operate with a GDC investigation.
11. That Committee went on to determine that Miss Riley-Allsopp's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of her misconduct and her conviction. In reaching this finding the Committee had regard to the need to protect the public as well as the wider public interest. It took account of the lack of information from Miss Riley-Allsopp to suggest that she had taken steps to address her conduct. The Committee determined to suspend Miss Riley-Allsopp's registration for a period of 12 months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration. The Committee made recommendations about the information that Miss Riley-Allsopp might wish to produce to a future reviewing Committee.
12. The PCC duly reviewed Miss Riley-Allsopp's suspension on 13 September 2024. Miss Riley-Allsopp was again not present and was not represented in her absence. That reviewing Committee noted that Miss Riley-Allsopp had not provided any information to suggest that she had addressed the index Committee's findings. It went on to conclude that her fitness to practise remained impaired, and that it would be appropriate to extend her period of suspended registration by 12 months, again with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of extended suspension. The Committee also made recommendations about the information that Miss Riley-Allsopp might wish to produce to a future reviewing Committee.
13. It falls to this Committee to review the extant suspension.

### **Summary of submissions**

14. In its written submissions the GDC invited the Committee to find that Miss Riley-Allsopp's fitness to practise remains impaired, given her lack of engagement and the absence of evidence of insight and remediation. The GDC invited the Committee to direct that her registration be indefinitely suspended.
15. Miss Riley-Allsopp's representations are set out at paragraph (8) above.

### **Committee's determination**

16. The Committee has carefully considered all the information presented to it, including the submissions of the GDC and the correspondence from Miss Riley-Allsopp.
17. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee bore in mind that Miss Riley-Allsopp bears the effective burden of demonstrating that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

### **Impairment**

18. The Committee has determined that Miss Riley-Allsopp's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of misconduct and conviction. The Committee noted that Miss Riley-Allsopp has not provided any information to demonstrate that she has developed insight into, or has taken any steps to remedy, her misconduct. Miss Riley-Allsopp has also not provided information to demonstrate that she has reflected upon and remediated the offending behaviour underlying, and resulting in, her criminal conviction. The Committee considers that the same risks to the public as previously identified by the index PCC and the reviewing PCC remain, and that Miss Riley-Allsopp's fitness to practise remains impaired.
19. The Committee also considers that a finding of impairment is also, and again, required in the wider public interest, more particularly in order to once more declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession. The Committee makes this repeat finding in relation both to Miss Riley-Allsopp's misconduct and conviction.

### **Sanction**

20. The Committee next considered whether it would be appropriate to revoke the suspension, or to replace the suspension with a direction of conditional registration.
21. The Committee considered that, given its findings of current impairment, revoking the suspension would place the public at considerable risk of harm, and would also undermine public trust and confidence in the profession.
22. The Committee next considered whether it could formulate conditions which would be workable and which would address the persistent risks that have been identified. The Committee concluded that it could not formulate any conditions which would be practicable or workable, given that Miss Riley-Allsopp has not substantively engaged with today's hearing, or indeed the two previous hearings, and has provided no indication of any willingness to engage with any conditions that might be capable of being formulated.
23. The Committee then went on to consider whether it would be appropriate to extend the current period of suspension. The Committee concluded that a further period of suspension is unlikely to serve any meaningful purpose. Miss Riley-Allsopp has not engaged in these proceedings in any substantive way for a considerable period of time, and has provided no evidence to demonstrate that she has taken steps to develop insight into and remediation of her misconduct and conviction, or that she intends to do so in the future. In light of Miss Riley-Allsopp's ongoing lack of engagement, the absence of any evidence from her to demonstrate that she has acknowledged, addressed and remedied the matters giving rise to these proceedings, and the risks to the public and the wider public interest arising from her misconduct and her behaviour relating to her conviction, the Committee considers that indefinite suspension is the appropriate and proportionate outcome.
24. The Committee hereby directs that Miss Riley-Allsopp's registration be suspended indefinitely in accordance with section 36Q (1) (d) of the Act.

### **Right of appeal**

25. Miss Riley-Allsopp will have 28 days from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served on her to appeal against this decision. Should she decide to appeal, the

extant suspension will remain in force until the resolution of any such appeal. Should she decide not to appeal, the indefinite suspension will take effect at the end of the 28-day appeal period, and the current suspension will continue to be in place until the indefinite suspension takes effect.

**Subsequent reviews**

26. This direction may be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of section 36Q (4) of the Act. More particularly, Miss Riley-Allsopp may, after two years have elapsed from the date on which this direction of indefinite suspension takes effect, ask for the indefinite suspension to be reviewed.
27. That concludes this case for today.